## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator:		Team:	CCRB Case #:	<b>▼</b> Force	☐ Discourt.	U.S.
Glenn Brown		APU	201411804	_	_	_
Glenn Brown		APU	201411804	☑ Abuse	O.L.	✓ Injury
Incident Date(s)		Location of Incident:		Precinct:	18 Mo. SOL	EO SOL
Thursday, 11/20/2014 7:50 PM		Myrtle Avenue-Broadway JMZ Subway Station		83	5/20/2016	5/20/2016
Date/Time CV Reported		CV Reported At:	How CV Reported	: Date/Time	e Received at CC	RB
Fri, 11/21/2014 11:43 AM	:43 AM CCRB		Phone	Fri, 11/21	Fri, 11/21/2014 11:43 AM	
Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Addı	ress			
Witness(es) Home Address						
Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command			
1. POM Evans Mazile	09374	948491	TB DT33			
2. SGT Richard Siedman	03953	942841	PSA 3			
Officer(s)	Allegatio	n		Inv	estigator Reco	nmendation
A.POM Evans Mazile	Force: PC	Evans Mazile used p	pepper spray against§	87(2)(b)		
B.POM Evans Mazile	Force: PC	Evans Mazile struck	§ 87(2)(b) wit	th an asp.		

with the use of force.

<u>Case Summary</u>
On November 20, 2014, at approximately 7:50 pm, PO Evans Mazile of Transit District 33
stopped \$87(2)(b) and his girlfriend \$87(2)(b) inside the Myrtle-Broadway
JMZ subway station in Brooklyn for theft of services. When \$87(2)(6) stated that he did not
have his identification, PO Mazile attempted to place him into handcuffs, and §87(2)(b) refused
to give PO Mazile his hands. PO Mazile pepper-sprayed \$87(2)(b) and then struck him once in
the leg and once in the head with his baton ( <b>Allegations</b> $\overline{A}$ and $\overline{B}$ ). Additional units responded to
the station in order to assist. Sgt. Richard Siedman of PSA 3 told [887(2)(b)] "Let go right now
or I'm going to Tase you," (Allegation C). \$87(2)(b) was arrested and charged with \$87(2)(b)
S S J ) ( sgart sy
and § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(a) Fam. Ct. Act § 381.3
[§ 87(2)(b)] [§\$ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]
The latter portion of the incident was captured
by numerous unidentified bystanders and was covered by numerous news media outlets (see
Video and Board Review 02 and 03). This case was on DA Hold from November 24, 2014 until
May 19, 2015.
Mediation, Notice of Claim, and Criminal Histories
This case was not suitable for mediation. §87(2)(b) filed a Notice of Claim with the City in
•
which he claimed, among other things, personal, emotional, and physical injury, false arrest,
negligence, and malicious prosecution. §87(2)(b) is seeking \$3,000,000 as redress (see Board
Review 04) [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]
Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories
• This is \$87(2)(b) s first CCRB complaint (see Board Review 06).
• This is the first CCRB complaint to involve \$87(2)(6) (see Board Review 07).
PO Mazile has been a member of service for five years and there are no substantiated
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
allegations against him.
• Sgt. Siedman has been a member of service for 12 years and this is the first CCRB complaint
against him.
· ·
Potential Issues
Potential Issues  The countlein ant/mitness in the case NOVINIA and a Oll college NOVINIA was a greating.
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) so civil
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b)
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b)
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney. \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)  Findings and Recommendations  Allegation A) Force: PO Evans Mazile used pepper spray against \$87(2)(b)
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(d)  Findings and Recommendations  Allegation A) Force: PO Evans Mazile used pepper spray against \$87(2)(b) [s 87(2)(b)] (see NYPD Documents 01 and
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)  Findings and Recommendations  • Allegation A) Force: PO Evans Mazile used pepper spray against \$87(2)(b) It is undisputed that PO Mazile pepper-sprayed \$87(2)(b) (see NYPD Documents 01 and 02). \$87(2)(b) s pepper-spraying was not captured on video (see Video and Board Review 02).
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)  Findings and Recommendations  • Allegation A) Force: PO Evans Mazile used pepper spray against \$87(2)(b) (see NYPD Documents 01 and 02). \$87(2)(b) s pepper-spraying was not captured on video (see Video and Board Review 02). PO Mazile explained that after he instructed \$87(2)(b) to stand up and place his hands
The complainant/ witness in the case, \$87(2)(b) and a 911 caller, \$87(2)(b) were uncooperative with the required agency attempts to obtain a sworn statement regarding the incident (though both of them provided brief phone statements). \$87(2)(b) was unavailable and \$87(2)(b) s civil attorney \$87(2)(b) , offered the CCRB the opportunity to sit in on \$87(2)(b) s 50h hearing, but declined to have him provide a statement directly to the CCRB. \$87(2)(b) was also unavailable (see Board Review 08). \$87(2)(g)  Findings and Recommendations  • Allegation A) Force: PO Evans Mazile used pepper spray against \$87(2)(b) It is undisputed that PO Mazile pepper-sprayed \$87(2)(b) (see NYPD Documents 01 and 02). \$87(2)(b) s pepper-spraying was not captured on video (see Video and Board Review 02).

then placing his hands behind his back. When PO Mazile grabbed \$87(2)(b) shands,
brought them around to the front of his body, near his midsection, and leaned over. Even
though PO Mazile did not suspect § 87(2)(b) was armed, § 87(2)(b) was wearing a hooded
sweatshirt with a pouch in front and PO Mazile did not know what §87(2)(b) might have had
inside of this pouch, which was in the general area of where \$87(2)(b) brought his hands, and
PO Mazile could not see if [897(2)] was reaching for something. PO Mazile took out his
pepper-spray and instructed \$87(2)(b) to place his hands behind his back or else he would be
pepper-sprayed. §87(2)(b) briefly brought his hands behind his back, PO Mazile put his pepper-
spray away, but when he grabbed \$87(2)(b) s hands, \$87(2)(b) brought his hands back in
front of his body near his sweatshirt's pouch. PO Mazile removed his pepper-spray, brought it
around the left side of \$87(2)(b) s face and discharged his pepper-spray. \$87(2)(b) quickly
turned his head so that the stream hit the side and rear of his head, which kept it out of his eyes.
PO Mazile discharged his pepper-spray instead of grabbing \$87(2)(b) shands because he felt
that it was safer, particularly because he did not know what safer, particularly because he did not know what
reaching for in the pouch, and he could have cut PO Mazile.
Patrol Guide Procedure 212-95 allows officers to discharge pepper-spray on individuals who
are actively resisting arrest. The Procedure notes that pepper-spray will reduce or eliminate the
need to use "substantial physical force" in order to make an arrest and should not be used in
situations that do not require the use of physical force. Patrol Guide Procedure 203-11 affords
officers the minimum necessary force to make an arrest (see Board Review 09).
§ 87(2)(g)
• Allegation B) Force: PO Evans Mazile struck \$87(2)(5) with an asp.
• Allegation B) Force: PO Evans Mazile struck \$87(2)(5) with an asp.  It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$87(2)(5) once in the left leg with his asp and then
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck save once in the left leg with his asp and then
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck some once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck saze once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with saze once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck solve once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with solve on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$87(2)(0) once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$87(2)(0) standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$87(2)(0) crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck solutions once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with solutions standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. Solutions crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion.
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$87(2)(0) once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$87(2)(0) standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$87(2)(0) crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$37(2)(b) once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$37(2)(b) standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$37(2)(b) crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$37(2)(b) had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$37(2)(b) once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$37(2)(b) standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$37(2)(b) crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$37(2)(c) had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$87(2)(0) once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$87(2)(0) standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$87(2)(0) crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$87(2)(0) had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio (thus eliminating the possibility of placing a call for back-up) and because \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was resisting arrest and attempting to flee. PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the leg and felt that it had no effect so he swung again at \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ intending to hit him in the same place.
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio (thus eliminating the possibility of placing a call for back-up) and because \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was resisting arrest and attempting to flee. PO Mazile struck
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio (thus eliminating the possibility of placing a call for back-up) and because \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ was resisting arrest and attempting to flee. PO Mazile struck \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the leg and felt that it had no effect so he swung again at \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ intending to hit him in the same place. \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ stepped off of the bench, changing his position relative to PO Mazile's baton and PO Mazile struck \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ shead and not his leg. PO Mazile did not suspect that \$\frac{857(2)(0)}{2}\$ was
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio (thus eliminating the possibility of placing a call for back-up) and because \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was resisting arrest and attempting to flee. PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ intending to hit him in the same place. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ stepped off of the bench, changing his position relative to PO Mazile's baton and PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ shead and not his leg. PO Mazile did not suspect that \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was armed and PO Mazile did not recall \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ attempting to punch or strike him.
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck struck once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. The crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. Have been had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio (thus eliminating the possibility of placing a call for back-up) and because struck was resisting arrest and attempting to flee. PO Mazile struck struck struck once in the leg and felt that it had no effect so he swung again at struck intending to hit him in the same place. The struck struck struck beard off of the bench, changing his position relative to PO Mazile's baton and PO Mazile struck str
It is undisputed that PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ once in the left leg with his asp and then again directly on top of his head, resulting in substantial bleeding and a laceration that required three sutures to close (see NYPD Documents 02).  The video recording of the incident begins with \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ standing on top of a bench in the subway station and PO Mazile striking him once on the leg with a baton swing akin to the swing of a baseball bat. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ crouches down on the bench at the same time that PO Mazile brought his baton back and took an overheard swing downward in a chopping motion. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ had one foot on the ground when PO Mazile struck him once on the top of the head (see Video and Board Review 02).  PO Mazile stated that he drew his asp because he had dropped his pepper-spray and radio (thus eliminating the possibility of placing a call for back-up) and because \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was resisting arrest and attempting to flee. PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ intending to hit him in the same place. \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ stepped off of the bench, changing his position relative to PO Mazile's baton and PO Mazile struck \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ shead and not his leg. PO Mazile did not suspect that \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ was armed and PO Mazile did not recall \$\frac{87(2)(0)}{2}\$ attempting to punch or strike him.

physical injury or death to the pers		ould, whenever possible, strive to	strike
extremities and larger muscle groups 87(2)(9)	ips, such as the torso.		
S 01 (2)(9)			
• Allegation C) Abuse of Auth	ority: Sgt. Richard S	iedman threatened § 87(2)(b)	
with the use of force.		-	
		'Let go right now or I'm gonna T	ase
you." It is also undisputed that Sgt			
The video recording of the inc			
were covered in blood and that a v of Sgt. Siedman making this remai			
video when § 87(2)(b) finally bro			II tile
Sgt. Siedman stated that he ma			
actively resisting arrest and there		•	
remark, Sgt. Siedman did not know	w who was injured. Sg	t. Siedman also noted that a crow	d had
formed.			
		nay employ a Taser in order to ov	vercome
resistance from a suspect. The Pro			
employing a Taser, including: the if the officer is in a hostile environ			ory, and
§ 87(2)(g)	inicii (see board Revi	zw 09).	
S ( ),(0)			
Pod:11			
Investigator:			
Signature	Print	Date	
Cuparticar			
Supervisor: Title/Signature	Print	Date	
i inc/Signature	1 11111	Date	
Reviewer:			
Title/Signature	Print	Date	

Page 4 CCRB Case # 201411804

Reviewer:			
Title/Signature	Print	Date	